DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 134 CS 502 190

AUTHOR Enos, Richard Leo, Ed.; Wiethoff, William E., Ed.
TITLE "H TEXNH: Research Methods and Topics for the History of Rhetoric"; Proceedings of the Speech Communications Association Doctoral Honors Seminar (Ann Arbor, Michigan, March 3-5, 1978).
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discourse Analysis; European History; Historical Criticism; Literary Criticism; *Literary History; Medieval History; Persuasive Discourse; *Philosophy; *Research Methodology; *Rhetoric; *Rhetorical Criticism
IDENTIFIERS Aristotle; Cicero (Marcus Tullius); Mill (John Stuart); Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso); Whately (Richard)

ABSTRACT

The interpretation of the history of rhetoric was the subject of the seminar reported in this document. After a preface and a discussion of the "promise" of rhetoric, abstracts of seminar presentations are grouped under the headings of rhetoric and culture, rhetoric and philosophy, methodological considerations, and discourse analysis. Abstracts deal with the following topics: selected functions of myth in ceremonial oratory; radical visions and American dreams; theoretical and methodological considerations in contemporary rhetorical history; the problem of volition in the history of rhetorical theory; Aristotle's example of rhetorical induction; the rhetoric of public discussion and John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty"; the scope of Richard Whately's rhetoric; eloquence as a cultural ideal; research methods for English rhetoric of the early sixteenth century; the importance of commentaries for the study of medieval rhetoric; the late tenth century monk Aelfric as rhetorician; the relationships of rhetoric, poetic, and music in late medieval and renaissance thought; argument and Cicero's "Pro Milone"; reading in Hellenic Greece; a rhetorical analysis of Caesar's prebattle speeches; and rhetoric in Ovid's "Heroides." (Ordering information for the complete documents is enclosed.) (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157134

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

H TEXNH

Proceedings of the Speech Communication Association 1978 Doctoral Honors Seminar "Research Methods and Topics for the History of Rhetoric"

EDITORS

Richard Leo Enos
The University of Michigan

William E. Wiethoff
Indiana University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Tony M. Lentz
Wingate College

Douglas Salerno
Washtenaw Community College

Co-Sponsored by University of Michigan and Indiana University
under the Auspices of
The Speech Communication Association Research Board

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Leo Enos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS502190

This monograph is distributed without charge to all interested readers. In lieu of payment, the editors encourage recipients to send donations to: *The Karl R. Wallace Memorial Fund*, Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041, United States of America.

Copyright ©, 1978, Richard Leo Enos

Cover design reproduced in part from the frontispiece of Thomas Gibbons' *Rhetoric* (London: J. and W. Oliver, 1767).

In Memoriam

KARL R. WALLACE

Magister et Vir Doctus Rhetoris

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The risk of any "acknowledgments" section is that deserving individuals will not be mentioned. Notwithstanding that warning, the directors wish to thank all senior critics and student participants. Special appreciation is extended to Marilyn J. VanGraber for reading Professor Ehninger's manuscript in his absence. In addition, the following individuals are thanked for their unfailing kindness and consideration:

John E. Baird, Jr.
Vincent M. Bevilacqua
Edward Bitner
Robert Brady
Harry Caplan
Ritch and Joan Eich
Dennis Gouran
Deborah Guido
Daniel and Barbara O'Keefe
Ann Harmon
Jane E. Helppie
Wilbur S. Howell
Everett Lee Hunt
Tony and Alicia Lentz
Howard and Lila Martin
Jeanne L. McClaran
Helen North
Katherine Notestine
Sammie Oster
Becky Prophet
Luke and Barbara Reinsma
Douglas and Diane Salerno
The SCA Research Board
Howard and Beverly Sypher
Akiko Tokuza
The Professional Theatre Program
Loren VanBuren
Mary Vielhaber
Mrs. Karl R. Wallace
Cheryl Wiethoff
Edgar E. Willis
William York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

PARTICIPANTS vi

PREFACE viii

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: Douglas W. Ehninger
The University of Iowa 1

REPORTS AND ABSTRACTS:

I. *Rhetoric and Culture* 10

Michael A. DeSousa, The University of Iowa
John L. Lucaites, The University of Wisconsin
Kathleen J. Turner, Purdue University

II. *Rhetoric and Philosophy* 14

James A. Aune, Northwestern University
William Lyon Benoit, Wayne State University
Richard A. Cherwitz, The University of Iowa
Lois Einhorn, Indiana University
Nola J. Heidlebaugh, The Pennsylvania State University
James W. Hikins, The University of Iowa

III. *Methodological Perspectives* 20

Roselyn L. Freedman, Morris Harvey College
Paul E. Prill, Indiana University
Luke M. Reinsma, The University of Michigan
Stephen M. Weinstock, The University of Washington

IV. *Discourse Analysis* 26

Katy Bachman, The University of Virginia
Tony M. Lentz, The University of Michigan
Douglas Salerno, Washtenaw Community College
Richard L. Street, Jr., The University of Texas

Requests for manuscripts may be made directly to the authors at their respective institutions.

PARTICIPANTS

Directors

Richard Leo Enos, The University of Michigan
William E. Wiethoff, Indiana University

Keynote Speaker

Douglas W. Ehninger, The University of Iowa
[Because of illness, Professor Ehninger was unable to attend the seminar. Appreciation is extended to Marilyn J. VanGraber for reading Professor Ehninger's speech.]

Senior Critics

Floyd Anderson, State University of New York at Brockport
Harry W. Bowen, Eastern Michigan University
Keith V. Erickson, Texas Tech University
James S. Measell, Wayne State University
Ray E. McKerrow, The University of Maine
Donovan J. Ochs, The University of Iowa
Robert W. Smith, Alma College
Michael Volpe, The University of Virginia

Student Participants

James A. Aune, Northwestern University
Katy Bachman, The University of Virginia
William Lyon Benoit, Wayne State University
Richard A. Cherwitz, The University of Iowa
Michael A. DeSousa, The University of Iowa
Lois Einhorn, Indiana University
Roselyn L. Freedman, Morris Harvey College
Nola J. Heidlebaugh, The Pennsylvania State University
James W. Hikins, The University of Iowa
Terry M. Lentz, The University of Michigan
John L. Lucaites, The University of Wisconsin
Paul E. Prill, Indiana University
Luke M. Reinsma, The University of Michigan
Douglas Salerno, Washtenaw Community College
Richard L. Street, Jr., The University of Texas
Kathleen J. Turner, Purdue University
Stephen M. Weinstock, The University of Washington

**This monograph
could not have been published
had it not been for the support
of Professor and Mrs. Douglas W. Ehninger.**

Preface

A Personal Note

As befits the subject, the spirit of this Doctoral Honors Seminar is best realized through historical background. In May of 1969 I had the good fortune to hear Professor Everett Lee Hunt speak at the annual Cal State Conference in Rhetorical Criticism. The term "good fortune" is clearly an understatement, for meeting Professors Hunt and Harry Caplan, who came over from Stanford to hear his old friend speak, was a major event in devoting my life to studying the history of rhetoric. As is the case with many undergraduates, I was not sure what emphasis I ought to have when I left Hayward and began my graduate studies at Indiana University. My meeting with these two gentlemen, however, replaced my own indecision with conviction.

I clearly remember Hal Barrett, the director of the conference, stating that Professor Hunt would be willing to answer any questions after his address. Unfortunately for Professor Hunt, my enthusiasm overcame my consideration and I asked questions until two in the morning! Yet, Professor Hunt seemed to enjoy his task and our dialogue was one of the most memorable of my life. A day or two after the conference, a friend and I were asked to return some material to Professor Caplan at Stanford. This task we willingly performed, for it provided us with the opportunity to engage Professor Caplan in conversation. I can still remember entering his office and seeing books and manuscripts stacked all over the room. After thanking us for the material, Professor Caplan encouraged us to stay and proudly showed us the works of his students as well as lamenting how much research still needed to be done in the history of rhetoric. It is difficult to put into words the thunder-struck feeling I had over those few days of actually talking with two of the greatest scholars in the history of rhetoric. I actually felt as if they had come down from Mt. Olympus rather than from across the San Francisco bay.

I would say that the word which best captures my feeling at that moment was "enthusiasm." Actually, this is a very appropriate

word, for it is rooted in a Greek cognate which means "in the spirit of the gods." I am fortunate to say that that feeling not only stayed with me after I left Cal State Hayward, but grew and was nurtured by an outstanding faculty at Indiana University. Through my graduate years at Indiana I kept remembering Professors Hunt and Caplan expressing their mutual hope that the speech communication discipline would continue to support rhetorical studies. Out of their conversation I seemed to sense a fear that the history of rhetoric would be neglected. Such a notion was unthinkable to me because of the great scholars who had done so much to enrich our knowledge of our discipline.

With no small amount of the hubris characteristic of many graduate students, I sent offprints of my first article to Professors Hunt and Caplan and proclaimed that they should have no fear, for rhetoric was a lively study which continued to be of major importance to speech communication. That correspondence initiated a flow of subsequent conversation which has lasted to this day. I hope that when these two gentlemen receive their copies of this monograph, they will realize the tremendous impact they have had on all of us.

Certainly, there are other great scholars who could proudly stand shoulder to shoulder with these distinguished men. The late Karl R. Wallace, Marie Hochmuth Nichols, James J. Murphy, Douglas Ehninger, George Kennedy and Wilbur Samuel Howell could equally share the laurels which apply to my personal contact with Professors Hunt and Caplan; indeed, my subsequent meetings with most of these individuals has done just that. What has made a singular impression on me is that each of the above individuals is not only a scholar in the most pristine sense, but also that their devotion to humanistic study is grounded in the fact that each one is a "humane" person. At the risk of sounding like Will Rogers, I have never met a scholar of rhetoric who did not impress me as a compassionate person devoted to an academic life of seeking intellectual excellence in his discipline. Anyone, for example, who has talked with Donovan J. Ochs will understand what that means.

This spirit for the study of the history of rhetoric was a major factor in presenting this Doctoral Honors Seminar. Similar to the enthusiasm generated from the individuals mentioned above, we hoped, in our own way, to transfer that zeal to promising students. In that sense, outstanding senior critics, many of whom were influenced by such individuals in much the same way I was, willingly offered their time and talents toward this effort. What we discovered was that the students selected to participate had already captured that same zeal for research. The result of such a collective interaction was one of the most stimulating intellectual

experiences which I have had. More than anything else, the spirit of scholarship demonstrated by our former teachers was apparent in these young students and with them the future for rhetorical studies seems bright indeed.

Richard Leo Enos
The University of Michigan

An Overview

The theory and practice of rhetoric have left a substantial task to be performed by their interpreters. Although many chroniclers have accepted the challenge, adequate documentation and analysis of rhetorical history remains a fugitive goal. Those who currently pursue rhetorical studies should be encouraged in their efforts, however, by the consistency of one ideal throughout the ages — the union of wisdom and eloquence. From the pre-literate days of Mycenae, when Greek heroes were tutored in both debate and the martial arts, through the Renaissance of mankind, in which the pursuit of eloquence always complemented the acquisition of knowledge, to the contemporary period, for which we constantly seek adequate means of expressing an ever-expanding store of information, rhetoric has remained both an outstanding need and satisfaction in human endeavor.

Satisfying the need for a professional blend of wisdom and eloquence in rhetorical studies is vital. The insightful and sometimes elegant bases for such studies have been laid in previous research, but the past merely invites students of rhetoric to conceive a new and satisfying architecture of research for the future. The seminar abstracted in this document represents one of the increasing number of opportunities for students of rhetoric to disseminate their work, but collected reports from seminar interest groups themselves recognize and promote specific improvements in future efforts. To a large extent, the quality of research into the history of rhetoric ultimately depends on the imagination and good will of interested scholars. If the ingenuity and personal commitment demonstrated by seminar participants in 1978 may be taken as a sign of the times, present and future, then the continuing task of recording and interpreting the history of rhetoric rests in capable hands.

William E. Wiethoff
Indiana University

The Promise of Rhetoric

Douglas W. Ehninger
The University of Iowa

The purpose of these remarks is two-fold: first, to review with you some of the reasons why work in the history of rhetorical thought claims a place in the circle of communication studies; and, second, to suggest some of the ways in which that claim may be validated and its promise realized.

As I am sure I hardly need tell you today, teaching and scholarship in the history of rhetoric, though they constitute one of the oldest and most commonly recognized subdivisions of our discipline, stand in active competition with a wide range of newer developments, each of which is loudly clammering for attention. One who has examined the program of the recent Washington meeting of the Speech Communication Association cannot fail to be amazed, if not disturbed, at the welter of specialized interests, both practical and applied, that are there represented. Our journals, too, offer articles on an increasingly broad spread of subjects and types of research — interpersonal and group communication, political discourse, nonverbal signal systems and the like.

Although each of us is entitled to his own opinion concerning some of the more exotic of these developments, it is not my intention here today to derogate any of them. Rather it is, as I have said, to remind you of the special niche which historical examinations of the theory of rhetoric occupy in the discipline of speech communication. And my contention is that in this respect the historian of rhetoric is equipped to make contributions that not only extend well beyond the reproduction of his kind, but are, indeed, of a nature that none of his fellows, despite their dispersion of interests, is able to duplicate.

What are these contributions and why are they important? Let me attempt to group my observations under two general heads.

First, I would point to the liberalizing influence exercized by studies in the history of rhetoric and would suggest that as the field of speech communication increasingly comes under the influence of an enveloping scientism the preservation and encouragement of the liberal tradition is a matter of first importance.

The student who knows something about theories of rhetoric as they have existed in times past is linked to one of the oldest and most persistent of all academic traditions — to a body of humanistic learning which furnished all of higher education in the language-oriented curriculum of the Roman schools, and which during the Middle Ages and much of the Renaissance teamed with

the companion disciplines of grammar and logic to form the core of university and grammar school training.

Moreover, during the period of his training the student of rhetoric's history is, as a matter of course, exposed at first hand to some of the acknowledged masterpieces of Western thought — to the relevant works of such writers as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Longinus, Augustine, Bacon, Campbell, and Mill. In these works he not only finds memorable statements concerning the role that the arts of communication should play in the making of a good society, but also encounters provocative accounts of the moral or ethical obligations that rest upon speakers and writers whatever the age in which they live.

Most importantly of all, perhaps, great treatises in the history of rhetoric have a peculiar way of making abstract or theoretical concepts come alive by presenting them in an applied or pragmatic context — an environment in which assumptions about what man is and how his life should be lived are translated into the specific terms of the communication process. George Campbell once said that a study of rhetoric furnishes the quickest, clearest, and easiest road to knowledge of the human understanding. By extension, we may say that it furnishes also the quickest, clearest, and easiest road to a knowledge of the customs and mores by which a society is governed and the values toward which it strives. Applied knowledge, whatever its limitations, at least has this much to said for it: that it gives the student a reason for learning what he is asked to learn. And certainly the student of rhetoric's history soon begins to see why it is important for him to know as much as he can about the social and methodological learnings upon which effective communication is thought to depend.

But not only may a study of rhetoric's past be a genuinely liberalizing experience; it also brings home to the future scholar or teacher important facts concerning the discipline he is about to profess.

For one thing, as he surveys different schools or systems of rhetorical thought the student comes to the realization that rhetoric is by nature a time and culture-bound phenomenon; something which arises out of a felt need and is in large part shaped by the intellectual and social environments in which that need exists. And this realization, in turn, introduces a healthy and much needed tolerance into studies that often are too much influenced by the notion that the currently fashionable way of looking at a matter is necessarily the best way of looking at it. The attitude which holds, for example, that the rhetorics of style or of elocutionism were aberrations or maladies is now fortunately surmounted, even though it is our own preference for simple, direct discourse. The fact, of course, is that except on strictly

moral grounds, no one system of rhetoric deserves preference. Each is to be judged on the basis of the services it renders to the culture of which it is a part. And in this respect the rhetorics of style and elocutionism performed valuable services for the generations who practiced them.

Second under this head, I would suggest that through his knowledge of the past the discerning student comes to appreciate the limitations under which any theory of rhetoric suffers, and comes to appreciate that in developing their systems all rhetoricians necessarily draw lines and erect boundaries where, in fact, none exist and therefore, to this extent, always give unreliable accounts of the territory they attempt to map. On at least two accounts, discourse in the rhetorical mode resists systematizing. First, human communication itself is inherently a fluid, ongoing, circular process without a definite beginning, middle or end. In order to be able to talk about communication, and hence rhetoric at all, not only must one slice off a segment of the whole, but he must arbitrarily stop or freeze motion within that segment, thus imposing a false status on something that is intrinsically kinetic. Second, rhetoric resists systematizing for the quite different but equally important reason that the several arts or skills upon which writing or speaking depends cannot effectively be isolated. As anyone who has attempted to write even the simplest undergraduate textbook on public speaking knows, style glides imperceptably into invention, on the one hand, and into disposition, on the other, while memory, as Ramus properly observed, is dependent upon both; and invention and disposition, as the formulary rhetoric recognized, may perform interchangeable functions.

Moreover, sooner or later he who thoughtfully studies rhetoric's history comes to recognize that the search for a comprehensive, all-embracing definition of rhetoric — the attempt to answer once and for all the questions "what is rhetoric?" except as an academic exercise — is largely profitless. The fact, of course, is that there is no single, generic definition lurking in the shadows and awaiting the person who will have the insight or acuteness necessary to discover it. Instead, as I have already suggested, there are many different rhetorics, each growing out of a particular set of social or cultural needs and designed to meet a contemporary purpose.

Fourth, I like to think that through his study of history a student learns that there is a difference between a rhetoric that is simply "good" and a rhetoric that is "good for something." And indeed, such a distinction needs to be made. Rhetoric, as Bryant and others have reminded us, is an instrumental rather than substantive discipline — one that is designed to do rather than merely

to be. Abstractly considered, a rhetoric geared to the Platonic ideal of communicating truth in order to make men better is to be ranked above one devoted to the ornamenting of language or the tricks of persuasion, and without doubt every "good" rhetoric has as its ultimate purpose the communication of "truth." But, at the same time, a rhetoric which conceives of "truth" as a transcendent entity and requires a perfect knowledge of the soul as a condition for its successful transmission automatically rules itself out as an instrument for doing the practical work of the world, and for this reason may be less desirable than a theory geared to the communication of contingent truths as established by probable rather than apodeictic proofs. In short, the problem of evaluating a rhetoric is a complex one, calling for a delicate balancing of the ideal with the utilitarian and for a precarious adjustment of means to ends. A study of the rhetorical theories of past ages should, I believe, arm us with an understanding of this important distinction.

And, finally, it seems to me that a knowledge of rhetoric's history opens to all of us a promise for the future. As some of you may have recognized, I have been averting to certain ideas which I first expressed a decade ago in an essay published in the journal *Philosophy and Rhetoric*. In that article, which was entitled "On Systems of Rhetoric," I was so bold as to speak of a possible metasystem of rhetorics, and of the hope that such a metasystem should inspire. And I said then — and I still believe — that while in one sense some of the major rhetorics of the Western world may be described as revolutionary, they also may perhaps be regarded as evolutionary. Although each, in one way or another, overthrew the premises — or, as my friend Bob Scott would say, the "starting point" — of its predecessor for a premise that was radically different and distinctly its own, it also appears that in each case the new starting point not only corrected a weakness in the preceding system, but encompassed that system and passed beyond it. Thus while the "new" rhetoric of the eighteenth century accepted much of the basic "grammar" worked out by the classical writers, it also raised its sights above the grammatical — that is, the sheer naming and arranging of the message-mind relationship. Similarly, contemporary theories, while accepting the crucial position which this relationship must occupy in a fruitful rhetoric, entertain the still broader purpose of exploring the social significance of the communicative act in all of its forms and uses.

Whether in the long run all major theories of rhetoric tend to correct deficiencies in their predecessors and to pass beyond them is, of course, an open question. It would seem, however, that through the ages, and despite occasional setbacks, rhetorics have constantly become richer in content and more embracing in scope.

Perhaps the central lesson to be learned from a study of theories past is that while the final word on the subject never has and probably never will be said, there is reason for optimism concerning the future of rhetoric as a discipline, reason to believe that as man's knowledge grows and his attempts to talk about influence-wielding discourse in a coherent and consistent fashion improve, the rhetoric he professes will ever become more penetrating and more fruitful.

But assuming that I have convinced you, as I hope I have, of the importance and challenge of continued investigations into the history of rhetorical thought, in what specific directions should we as students of the subject bend our efforts? What sorts of investigations should the young scholar in this field undertake and what method should be employed in pursuing them?

Considering the fact that workers in the field of speech communication first began to devote substantial attention to rhetoric's history in the mid 1920s, on the whole I believe we have a right to be proud of what has thus far been done. Let me outline some of our accomplishments.

We have completed studies of greater or lesser length on most of the major figures in the Anglo-American rhetorical tradition and have made considerable progress toward organizing their doctrines into more comprehensive surveys of the rhetorics of given times and places. Our knowledge of the rhetoricians of classical antiquity also is constantly increasing and growing in sophistication; nor, though our work in this area is more restricted, have we by any means failed to examine rhetorical thought as it has existed on the Continent during the last four centuries.

The roll of the scholars who have contributed to these developments is much too long to call here. Indeed, even to attempt to do so would, no doubt, unfairly reveal my own preferences and prejudices. To mention only the barest list, we have such classic works as Caplan's edition of the *Ad Herennium*, Dieter's monograph on *statis*, Wagner's analysis of Wilson, Wallace's books and articles on Bacon, Howell's surveys of British writers between 1500 and 1850, Parrish's pioneer edition of Whately, and Bevilacqua's work on the eighteenth century. But this list, of course, only scratches the surface, and is, I recognize, grossly unfair to the many authors whose very excellent writings are necessarily omitted.

At the same time, however, gratifying though our accomplishments have been, there is at this point no cause for complacency. While much admittedly has been done, much also awaits doing. Despite the efforts of such authors as Caplan, McKeon, Baldwin, and Murphy, our knowledge of the forms rhetoric took and the uses it served in medieval life and literature remain sketchy. Nor,

so far as I know, has there been more than one serious study of the effects of the Romantic movement on rhetoric — and that, by the way, was carried on by a doctoral student in a department of English and was designed to furnish background for an examination of the thought of the philosopher and scientist Michael Polanyi. Even this glancing blow, however, threw serious doubt on the rather common assumption that Romanticism sounded the death knell of rhetoric. Obviously, additional work in this whole area is called for.

Third, I would suggest that many of the important figures in Continental rhetoric, particularly of the early modern period — Johann Sturm, Balthazer Gilbert, Charles Rollin, Gerhard Vossius, and the like — are still to most of us little more than names caught in an occasional footnote.

Turning to more recent times, our knowledge of how the prevailing elocutionism of the late nineteenth century gradually passed through the notion of rhetoric as the art of effective expression in written prose and eventually emerged as the sort of doctrine found today in the average speech textbook is, to say the least, sketchy.

And then, of course, there lies before us, as it does before historians of every sort, the endless task of reinterpreting and reappraising — of going back over ground that already has been covered in the attempt to arrive at an improved understanding and deeper appreciation of the works that constitute rhetorical literature. After all, it was by looking at old evidence in new ways that Grote rehabilitated the Sophists, that Parks led us to re-evaluate the usefulness of the instruction in speaking and writing offered in the Roman schools, that Howell was led to suggest a more balanced view of the sixteenth century rhetoric of style, and that Bitzer came to throw important new light on George Campbell's sources.

But over-riding all else and standing as a challenge to each of us is the continuing need ever to become better scholars and researchers — to do whatever we do with a higher level of competence and sophistication. Certainly it should give us pause, if not shame, to recall that a great deal of the very best work in the history of rhetorical thought has been done by scholars in disciplines other than speech communication. Sad to report, it was not we who have written the books of George Kennedy, Donald L. Clark, M. L. Clarke, or Edward Meredith Cope; just as we have left to Hugh Davidson, a professor of Romance languages, the interesting and important task of tracing the changing conception of rhetoric in France during the seventeenth century.

But enough of this catalogue. In closing, I should like to address myself to the second of the two questions I raised a moment ago,

that having to do with the methodology historians of rhetoric should employ in carrying on their inquiries. On this head, as I have elsewhere argued, it seems to me that the central task of the historian of rhetorical thought is to explore the nexus between theories of communication and the intellectual, cultural and socio-political environments in which those theories arose and flourished. How may a knowledge of these environments help us to understand more fully the functions which in a given age rhetoric was assigned to perform? How, in turn, may a knowledge of prevailing rhetorical theories lend insight into the sorts of ideas that people entertained and the values that they prized in ages past? These, it seems to me, are the principal questions with which the historian of rhetorical thought should concern himself.

My argument in support of this thesis is a familiar one, and may be outlined as follows: Because rhetoric is by definition a study of how verbal and nonverbal symbols may be employed by one person to enlarge the understanding or influence the beliefs or actions of another, as a discipline rhetoric's closest points of contact always are with epistemology, logic, and ethics. However, because attempts to inform or persuade necessarily occur within a given socio-political context, rhetoric also has secondary, but none the less important, points of contact with politics and with the commonly held body of beliefs and values that we somewhat loosely label the "culture" of an age.

Consciously or unconsciously, everyone who thinks or writes or whoever has thought or written about rhetoric, makes certain assumptions concerning these matters — assumptions about how people come to know what they know and believe what they believe; about how their emotions are aroused or placated; about the way claims may be supported and disputes rising out of conflicting claims resolved in a manner that is productive of the common good. And it is different assumptions or points of view concerning these same matters which, at bottom, account for the various doctrines which it is the business of the historian of rhetoric to record and interpret.

In this sense, then, I would argue that surveying the connections between rhetorical systems and the environments in which those systems are embedded constitutes the natural and unique province of the historian of rhetoric — natural because it traces directly the foundations out of which each and every system of rhetoric necessarily arises, and unique because no other branch of historical scholarship takes the study of this connection as its own special province or preserve. Bereft of their intellectual, cultural, and socio-political environments, accounts of what rhetoricians have written or said in times past are reduced to the level of annals. Instead of being history in the true sense of the word, they

are arid catalogues of names, dates and passages; a record of who said what, when, under the influence of which predecessors and with what effect on those who followed.

Some years ago in an article published in the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, P. Albert Duhamel asserted that considered in the abstract, rhetoric is simply the empty — the contentless — concept of effective expression, and therefore the character of any particular theory of rhetoric varies according to the aims expression is intended to serve and the criteria by which good or effective expression is judged. For one age, effective expression means one thing; for another age, something quite different.

Because the ancients lived in a predominantly oral culture in which much of the most important business of society was transacted in the public forum of the political assembly or courtroom, for them rhetoric quite naturally became the art of effective oral persuasion, the art of the orator. During the Renaissance, political and social forces combined with changes in taste so as to remove rhetoric from the public sphere and to make of it an aesthetically oriented art of personal ingratiation — an art of talking or writing up the social scale in a manner that would win favor with one's superiors. Today, under the influence of the electronic media, the centrality of the oral mode is again asserting itself.

In these and other more particularized cases I might cite, were there need to continue so well-known a story, the abstract concept of rhetoric as the art of effective expression has remained constant, while the kinds or patterns of discourse that are thought desirable or effective have undergone constant revision. It is, then, the relation between these revisions and the forces that have motivated them which, I suggest, constitutes the natural and unique subject matter of the history of rhetorical thought.

Now I certainly would not pretend that every study produced by one who thinks of himself as a historian of rhetoric should speak directly to the nexus I have been describing. Obviously, some studies may have as their legitimate purpose verifying dates, establishing chronologies, transcribing manuscripts, preparing editions and the like. My point is that in the past these activities sometimes have been regarded as ends in themselves rather than as contributions to the final goal of describing how, over the ages, rhetorical theories have changed, and connecting these changes with the intellectual, cultural and socio-political forces which have brought them about. This, I hold, always should be regarded as the ultimate goal.

Admittedly, what I am calling for is a comprehensive account of rhetoric's place in the history of ideas and such an account is by no means an easy thing to provide. To do so not only requires a

thorough understanding of the dimensions and facets of rhetoric as an art, but also an intimate acquaintance with the intellectual movements and the social conditions prevalent in a given period. Let me, however, in closing mention as models for your examination and spurs for your ambition a number of studies which seem to me to have well achieved the sort of amalgam I here have in mind. Obviously such a list must be highly subjective and must be limited by my own acquaintance with the literature. Certainly, however, I would want to include in any such catalogue Everett Hunt's masterful analysis of how differences in temperament, politics, metaphysics, and ethics account for Plato's and Aristotle's divergent attitudes toward the uses and values of rhetoric. And I should also want to find a place for Father Walter Ong's description of the influence that the introduction of print in the fifteenth century had on the development of spatial thinking and consequently on the conception of rhetorical topics. For the eighteenth century, you might look at Gerald Hauser's discussion of the epistemological assumptions which underlay the rise of description to a position of central importance in theories of persuasion, and to Vincent Bevilacqua's investigation into the factors that led rhetoricians of this period to reduce rhetoric to a communicative function, detach invention from the other *officia*, and place a new emphasis on style in the broad sense of the management of a discourse.

What we can learn from works such as these, I believe, will stand us in good stead as we evaluate rhetoric in the present and as we devise rhetorics to use in the years ahead. For this is surely what we will have to do. If the history of our discipline teaches us anything, it is that in rhetoric the past is never wholly applicable to the present or the future — that each succeeding age must face anew the challenge of devising a rhetoric suited to its own needs and fitted to its own purposes. What the past does is to show us options and suggest directions in which we may move. In the absence of history we always would have to be starting afresh. Armed with the knowledge it provides, we can move toward our goals more directly and with a greater likelihood of success.

I. Rhetoric and Culture

Throughout the ages scholars have observed that the formation, maintenance and evolution of human societies have been predicated upon man's unique capacities as a symbol creating and symbol using animal. It is from this perspective that we should be able to infer that rhetoric is basic to culture. And indeed, this seems to be the conclusion at which Professor Ehninger arrived in his keynote address to this conference when he suggested that:

> George Campbell once said that a study of rhetoric furnishes the quickest, clearest, and easiest road to a knowledge of the human understanding. By extension, we may say that it furnishes also the quickest, clearest and easiest road to a knowledge of the customs and mores by which a society is governed and the values to which it strives.

Thus, we believe that an examination of the rhetorical dimensions of society are essential to any understanding of "culture."

The first task which we believe that students of history of rhetoric must address themselves to is a specific determination of the relationship between rhetoric and culture. Too often in the past, students of situational approaches to rhetoric have assumed that rhetoric was a reflector of culture. We do not believe that the relationship between rhetoric and culture is merely that of the container and the thing contained. Rather, we see rhetoric and culture as achieving a co-equal, symbiotic relationship. As far as we can tell, rhetoric reflects, but more importantly, transforms culture. Hence, we would argue that it would be more productive to examine culture as a grand instance of symbolic reality in which rhetoric elicits, maintains and transforms culture, than it would be to merely posit culture as the contextual or scenic background in which rhetoric occurs.

In order to implement such a perspective on the relationship between rhetoric and culture, it is necessary to adopt an avid methodological eclecticism. It is our belief that the scholar of the rhetorical phenomenon ought to be open to all critical tools which can be of assistance in uncovering the evolutionary relationship between *cultures* and *rhetorics*. Consequently, we need to begin by defining "culture" within the framework of its dominant symbolic forms. To the degree that the major symbolic forms of a specific culture (e g., drama, ritual, myth) articulate the reality of that culture, it is imperative that we begin in earnest to investigate the nature and function of such rhetorical forms. While there is veritably no limit to the kinds of studies which would be profitable in uncovering this symbiotic relationship between rhetoric and culture, we recognize two areas of study which are in command of

immediate attention:

1. An investigation of cultural forms *as* rhetorics. As societies evolve, their sociality, the essence of their particular cultures, are confined by the rhetorics in which its participants believe. Therefore, a close analysis of the cultural forms of any society (e.g., films, newspapers, fashions, fads) as rhetorics would offer a viable means of defining and describing both the parameters of a given society and the diversity of forms in which societies can develop.

2. An investigation into the history of cultural ideographs (i.e., words or symbols which represent entire systems of thought) such as "freedom," "liberty," "property" and "the American Dream." By tracing the rhetorical etymology of such symbols we believe that we can begin to uncover the underlying relationship between rhetoric and culture and the ways in which the two combine towards the creation of specific ideologies.

Ultimately, we, like Kenneth Burke in *A Grammar of Motives*, dedicate the task of uncovering the manifold relationships between rhetoric and culture toward the "purification of war." Burke's belief is that we need to try to "purify" war by taking it out of the realm of physical combat and reducing it to the level of verbal, dialectical combat. As Burke writes (*A Grammar of Motives*) we need to:

> encourage tolerance by speculation...to take delight in the Human Barnyard, with its addiction to the Scramble, an area that would cause us great unhappiness could we not transcend it by appreciation, classifying and tracing back to their beginnings in Edenic simplicity those linguistic modes of suasion that often seem little better than malice and the lie... [and] to temper the extreme rawness of our ambitions, once we become aware of the ways in which we are the victims of our own and another's magic. (p. 442)

We believe that this task can be successfully completed only by reassessing our understanding of the relationship between rhetoric and culture; and, by recognizing that rhetoric is both cultural bound *and* a cultural creative enterprise.

Michael A. DeSousa
John L. Lucaites
Kathleen J. Turner

SELECTED FUNCTIONS OF MYTH IN CEREMONIAL ORATORY

Michael A. DeSousa
The University of Iowa

This paper rejects the traditional situational and stylistic approaches to epideictic or ceremonial speech since such approaches concentrate on developing a sense of composite or prototypical ceremonial public speeches at the expense of failing to illuminate individual ceremonial speeches. Offered in their places is a mythic approach to ceremonial speech which posits such addresses as instances for the distillation and articulation of social experiences in the form of distinct myths. Ceremonial speeches are seen as functioning to serve identifiable socio-emotional needs of immediate audiences through the articulation of shared meaning through the form of myth.

The paper draws upon both the anthropological-literary tradition of myth (myth as fantastic narrative), and the socio-political approach to myth (myth as social fiction), in order to develop a characterization of myth as a "cultural symbol" which serves as a repository of affective relations among members of a culture. Six modes of mythic expression are identified; association, resolution, identification, condensation, illustration and fantasy. These mythic modes correspond to specific functions the speeches serve for their immediate audiences such as status enhancement (association) and evasion of paradox (resolution). Ceremonial speech is posited not as mere *presentation* or ritualistic display, but as an *interaction* among speaker, audience, speech and historical moment which reinforces or elaborates a segment of social reality.

After an application of the mythic approach to two famous American eulogies serving distinctive functions for their respective audiences, a call is made for further work which examines myth as a primary symbolic form in the construction and transformation of consensus reality through the vehicle of the ceremonial speech. It is concluded that ceremonial speech as a genre of public discourse especially amenable to the expression of myth serves social ends equally vital as those served by more pragmatic speech forms in the courtroom and representative assembly.

RADICAL VISIONS AND AMERICAN DREAMS

John Louis Lucaites
The University of Wisconsin

This essay in an exploration into the relationship between "rhetoric" and "culture" and the ways in which the two interact towards the evolution of specific "ideologies." The author develops the phrase "Periods of Persuasibility" as a notion which can be used to help in explaining the interaction between ideological styles and the cultural environment in which they most often recur. In this essay the author looks at the periodic recurrence of radical-extremist ideologies in the history of the United States and argues that the style manifested by such ideologies is related to two discrete but closely associated concerns which have "clustered" about the core of the "American Dream": first, an interest in the purity of American Nativism, and second, a deep regard for an ethic of equality. The meteoric rise and popularity for Father Charles Edward Coughlin, the "radio priest" from Royal Oak, Michigan, and his 1930s movement for "Social Justice" are examined as *one* specimen of this radical rhetorical tradition.

CONTEMPORARY RHETORICAL HISTORY: SOME THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Kathleen J. Turner
Purdue University

While Baskerville's recent *QJS* essay encourages scholars of speech communication to tackle the needs for good rhetorical history, one obstacle is the lack of historiographical sophistication within the field. Addressing historiographical concerns, therefore, the first part of this essay explores the questions of distance, objectivity and context in contemporary rhetorical history. The second section then examines the paradox of resources for contemporary history: the simultaneous overabundance and paucity of materials confronting the rhetorical scholar. The appendix describes the holdings of the presidential libraries pertinent to research in speech communication.

II. Rhetoric and Philosophy

The papers presented under the general heading of "Rhetoric and Philosophy" at the 1978 SCA Doctoral Honors Seminar reflect a number of very different theoretical interests and perspectives, ranging from an investigation in Aristotle's logic through John Stuart Mill's "rhetoric of public discussion" to the "problem of the will in the history of rhetoric." Yet despite the broad range of issues considered by the six participants in this program, a number of common themes emerged. In sum, the shared concerns of this program point to a number of specific avenues from which the study of the relationship of rhetoric to philosophy might be approached. Specifically, we suggest the following areas deserving further investigation:

1) *The Relationship between Rhetoric and the Various Subdisciplines of Philosophy:* The papers presented at this seminar underscore the assumption that rhetorical theory may offer a number of unique perspectives from which to analyze traditional philosophical problems. This fact would suggest rhetoric undertake to reexamine its relationship to philosophy and reevaluate rhetorical and philosophical approaches to common issues within the several periods comprising the history of rhetorical theory and practice. Such an undertaking should be particularly cognizant of defining the relationships between or among rhetoric and the several subdisciplines of philosophy. Research responding to this issue might be recognized as falling into more or less discrete areas of investigation such as rhetoric and epistemology, rhetoric and ethics, rhetoric and logic, rhetoric and ontology, etc.

2) *Moral and Ethical Issues in Rhetoric:* Of seminal importance is the need to assess the moral and ethical implications of rhetorical theories and practices. Such an assessment should have as its goal an evaluation of the moral efficacy of various rhetorics vis-a-vis the contemporary age and might well begin with a thorough reexamination of the work of those thinkers who have dealt with the ethics of rhetoric in the past.

3) *The Role of the Rhetorical Theorist in the Study of Communication Phenomena:* We believe it is within the purview of the rhetorical theorist to examine the philosophical presuppositions underpinning the argumentative claims of all those who study communication phenomena. Hence, the rhetorical theorist must range widely over the field of studies in communication, assessing the rhetorical dimensions, implications and assumptions of all such studies.

4) *The Relationship between Rhetorical Theory and Practice:* If the questions raised concerning the affiliation between rhetoric and philosophy are to embrace *discourse* broadly conceived, then

whenever possible, rhetoricians should seek to explicate the relationship between rhetorical theory and rhetorical practice.

5) *The Need for Rigor in Rhetorical Studies:* Whatever the precise nature of the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy, scholars in rhetoric must pursue rhetorical investigations with the same analytic rigor characteristic of traditional philosophic investigations.

It should be clear from these suggestions for future inquiry that we tend not to view the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy as a unidirectional matter. Rather, it is our judgment that any such affiliation is symbiotic, with rhetoric offering important elements to philosophy and philosophy likewise lending significant sustention to rhetoric. In essence, then, we seek not only to illuminate the relationship of rhetoric to philosophy but of philosophy to rhetoric as well.

James A. Aune
William Lyon Benoit
Richard A. Cherwitz
Lois Einhorn
Nola J. Heidlebaugh
James W. Hikins

THE PROBLEM OF THE WILL IN THE HISTORY OF RHETORICAL THEORY

James A. Aune
Northwestern University

One basic question appears common to all rhetorical traditions: how may we characterize that part of the human personality upon which — or with which — rhetoric acts? It is suggested in this paper that rhetorical theories may be distinguished from one another by noting if they view human persons as possessing "intellects" alone, "wills" alone, or a combination of both. Plato's ethical paradox, "virtue is knowledge," is a paradigm of the intellectualist theory. By demythologizing the concept of *ate* (judicial blindness sent by the gods) into the philosophical concept of appearance, Plato develops a theory of rhetoric limited to the production of clarity in the souls of its hearers. Plato's intellectualism is revealed in his critique of *Sophista* and his portrait of Socrates as the true rhetor. True rhetoric must: 1) be joined with dialectic, 2) avoid the mode of epideictic, 3) possess a sense of order, and 4) be clear. Since the will does not exist for Plato, he argues that the clear description of transcendent moral experience is the sole office of rhetoric.

Later rhetorical theory may be read as a dialectic between will and intellect. Augustine, for example, seems to have achieved a synthesis of Christian voluntarism and neo-Platonic intellectualism in his rhetorical theory. Occam's nominalistic emphasis upon the will destroyed Augustine's "dramatic symmetry" and paved the way for scientism and radical voluntarism.

The paper also discusses the dilemma of the self-understanding of contemporary American culture in terms of scientism's emphasis upon the intellectual as reflector of objects and in terms of the New Left's emphasis upon revolutionary will. It is suggested that, following Plato, rhetoric must be joined with the epistemic power of dialectic in order to increase the social power of the individual. It is also suggested that the dramatistic symmetry of the offices of rhetoric (*docere*, *delectare*, and *movere*) provides a better conception of the human psyche than intellectualism or voluntarism do.

ARISTOTLE'S EXAMPLE: THE RHETORICAL INDUCTION

William Lyon Benoit
Wayne State University

Gerard Hauser, utilizing evidence from the *Prior Analytics*, and

Scott Consigny, relying on evidence from the *Rhetoric*, claim that the example is a reasoning process from "part to part" without the use of an intervening "whole" or "rule." This paper, on the basis of evidence from both the *Prior Analytics* and the *Rhetoric*, advances the claim that the reasoning process inherent in the example moves from "part to whole to part." Then a more complete discussion of the example is offered.

The example is a rhetorical induction. It moves from a non-exhaustive examination of particular instances of a given class to a generalization about a property of that class, and then enthymematically applies that generalization to another specific instance. It differs from induction in three ways: it does not examine all of the particulars, it applies the generalizations to and deals with affairs that are mainly contingent. There are three types of example: actual past fact, illustrative parallel, and fable. Aristotle uses the term "example" to refer both to the reasoning process that moves from part to whole to part, and to specific instances which support and clarify propositions already supported. The example is more easily understood than the enthymeme, but is less forceful than it. Logically, the example is best suited for deliberative oratory but less so for forensic. Invented examples are easier to create but less persuasive than real examples. Examples may be refuted by providing negative examples or by claiming that the examples differ from the general example being drawn.

THE CONTEMPORARY IMPLICATIONS OF JOHN STUART MILL'S *ON LIBERTY*: A "RHETORIC OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION"

Richard A. Cherwitz and James W. Hikins
The University of Iowa

John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* has been largely ignored by rhetorical scholars as an important contribution to the discipline. This investigation reveals that Mill's nineteenth-century treatise embodies the tenets of a sophisticated theory of argument and makes clear the implications of that theory for contemporary rhetoric.

Of primary importance to an understanding of Mill's work and its significance in the history of rhetoric is his doctrine of assurance. Arguing that men come to know via their rhetorical intercourse with the marketplace of ideas, Mill advances a number of epistemological criteria. These criteria afford the reader the ability to rigorously assess knowledge claims and act as a basis for

an epistemology of rhetoric.

A major thrust of this study articulates Mill's doctrines in *On Liberty* as forerunners of a number of emphases in contemporary argument theory, including "self risk," "initiative and control" and argument as a "person making" activity.

Finally, utilizing Mill's distinctions, it is suggested that one may distinguish among at least three perspectives from which to view the claim that rhetoric is epistemic. These are subsequently developed and point toward future areas of research.

CONSISTENCY IN RICHARD WHATELY: THE SCOPE OF HIS RHETORIC

Lois Einhorn
Indiana University

Critics have argued that Richard Whately, in his *Elements of Rhetoric*, overstepped the boundaries that he set for himself in the "Introduction" and "Part I" of the work. His inclusion of the second part on the passions, third on style, and the final section on delivery has created some question as to the scope of his rhetoric. The two passages primarily responsible for the criticism are: "I propose in the present work...to treat of 'Argumentative Composition' *generally*, and *exclusively*; considering Rhetoric... as an off-shoot from Logic" (p. 4) and "The art of *inventing* and *arranging* Arguments is...the only province that Rhetoric can claim extirely and exclusively" (p. 40). By explicating these two passages, this paper shows that by including a discussion of persuasion, style and delivery, Whately did not contradict his announced purpose. The study concludes that although Whately used "exclusively" as a modifier in both of the problem passages, the referent and the meaning of the term differed. In the phrase, "argumentative composition generall and exclusively," the term "exclusively" modified "argumentative composition" and meant *only* (Whately dealt only with argumentative composition). In the second passage, "exclusively" modified the "province of Rhetoric" and meant *unique* (the finding and arranging of arguments was the unique tool of rhetoric). The first passage dealt with the subject matter of rhetoric; the second with the method. In addition to being internally consistent, the paper argues that the two passages are consistent with Whately's high regard for reasoning and with his ecclesiastical orientation and practical nature.

ETHICS AND LOGOS: ELOQUENCE AS A CULTURAL IDEAL

Nola Heidlebaugh
The Pennsylvania State University

Ultimately, our view of reality and of our ability to know it determines the way we treat people. An ontology in which the universe is beyond man's influence leads us to an epistemology in which knowledge is uncertain; that epistemology may lead in turn to unsatisfactory ethical systems, which promote either autocracy or anarchy. An ontology in which man is seen as exercising influence over the development of reality is more desirable, and two essays describing such an ontology imply that communication is an ideal in the subsequent ethical system.

A cultural idealization of eloquence made possible the profession of the sophists of 4th and 5th centuries B.C. in Greece. This idealization came from the art of the pre-literate epic poets and the professional position which they enjoyed, as well as from the notion of *doxa*, which was the heart of the Greek democratic system. *Doxa* was a belief that all citizens were capable of exercising the judgement necessary for the running of the state, and that all were therefore responsible for presenting their opinions *well* in the agora.

Although *doxa* has died in the twentieth century, taking with it liberalism as the Greeks knew it, eloquence lives on, though it is no longer a central cultural value for us. The Greek experience implies an understanding of eloquence as the forgoing of new realities by making new conceptions agreeable with old in an impressive way. We can employ eloquence to help re-develop an ethical system to which eloquence itself is central.

III. Methodological Perspectives

Douglas Ehninger has rightly pointed out in his keynote address that our knowledge of the rhetorical tradition during the Middle Ages and Renaissance is supported by only a handful of editions of pertinent treatises and by only the sketchiest of surveys. The ground-breaking works of Richard McKeon, James J. Murphy, Wilbur Samuel Howell, Karl R. Wallace and Walter J. Ong are fortunate exceptions.

The paucity of studies in the rhetoric of these periods results in part from the failure of many departments to aggressively encourage the study of classical and modern languages. Without a reading knowledge of classical languages, the student of the history of rhetoric cannot even begin to examine most of the primary sources which span the period between Hellenic Greece and the English Renaissance; without a knowledge of modern languages, the contributions of European scholars remain inaccessible. Another very real part of the problem is the almost insurmountable difficulties anyone initially encounters in confronting hundreds of manuscript catalogues, thousands of unedited manuscripts scattered throughout England and the continent, and thousands of rarely referenced incunabula. Introductions to research in these materials are greatly needed.

In order to facilitate further research in these periods, we propose the establishment of a clearinghouse, a central distribution point which might provide a guide to available and pertinent catalogues, manuscripts, editions, bibliographies and studies in the history of rhetoric — a sort of *Antiqua Collecteana Rhetorica.* Possible ERIC or University Microfilms could provide facilities for a key-word index to such materials. An annual newsletter, presenting an annotated bibliography of the year's work and accompanied by accounts of present and contemplated research, could prove equally useful. In the absence of such costly alternatives, we encourage the Rhetoric Society of America to continue its publication of bibliographies relevant to the history of rhetoric.

Several methodological concerns and topics for future research will further expand our understanding of the rhetorical tradition's influence during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. The rhetorical, grammatical and dialectical treatises must first of all be placed in a larger context. To the extent that a rhetoric is indebted to the intellectual, socio-political, religious and educational climate, it becomes a vital, living tradition that not only reflects its age but, at the same time, influences it. We suggest that, because of rhetoric's fundamental role in education for hundreds of years, the rhetorical tradition of a period will inevitably provide an

architectonic means of ordering and presenting experience. This influence may well extend beyond traditional modes of discourse to such related arts as poetics, music, architecture, painting and so on. Thus an exploration of the relationship between the rhetoric, cultural climate, and art of an age could bear fruitful results.

This matter of rhetorical context has many facets. We can note only a few that might effectively illuminate the predominately theoretical concerns of research in the history of rhetoric to this date. Primary sources — whether manuscripts, library catalogues, commentaries, homilies, sermons, incunabula, letters, or poems — can all provide significant evidence for the influence of the rhetorical tradition. And we continually need to consider the practitioners of the art of rhetoric. Once we gain a clearer understanding of the use of the Ciceronian, Sophistic/Formulary, Grammatical/Stylistic, and Aristotelian traditions of rhetoric in the work of preachers and poets, we can better follow the shifting definitions of rhetoric throughout the ages. Their adaptations of the rhetorical traditions can tell us much about how the notion of rhetoric changed to meet the exigencies of time and circumstance. We also need to spend more time on the Continent. As Ehninger has noted, the history of rhetoric in France, Germany and Italy has been too often ignored or too often considered only as an introduction to the rhetorical traditions of the English Renaissance. Finally, we need always to keep in mind the possible application of out methods and insights to contemporary issues in rhetoric. "Relevance" need not be taken as the *sine qua non* or our work, but it certainly cannot be ignored.

We close on a note of anticipation. Clearly the recent contributions of Michael Leff, Karin Fredborg and others to the history of rhetoric will continue to encourage further research in Medieval and Renaissance rhetoric. And seminars such as this can only promote more intensive and extensive study in the rhetorical traditions of these periods. Although very much remains to be done and much has yet to be written, at least a beginning has been made.

Roselyn L. Freedman
Paul E. Prill
Luke M. Reinsma
Stephen M. Weinstock

RESEARCH METHODS: ENGLISH RHETORIC OF THE EARLY SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Roselyn L. Freedman
Morris Harvey College

The sixteenth century was an era which witnessed political, religious and educational changes in England which were subsequently to influence the history of rhetoric. This paper treats the historical background, the educational and rhetorical background, and the sources for historical research in rhetoric. Included is a discussion of difficulties in conducting research within an English library, and an outline of initial results obtained. The English Reformation is revealed as political and legal action taken by King Henry VIII, with effects on the social, educational, economic and religious aspects of life, such as the adoption of English as *the* official language of England. Education is shown to be the direct inheritor of the traditions of the Middle Ages, with the ancient rhetorical traditions and the medieval arts of discourse available for use at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Changes in education are demonstrated as having been prompted as well by the introduction of the printing press, which enabled materials to have widespread, rather than limited, distribution. A paucity of primary source materials available in the United States is established as the basis for conducting research in England, notably in the King's Library of the British Museum. Several periods of concerted effort in burning manuscripts and books have reduced the number of works which are available for perusal. Locating those works that do exist is extremely time consuming, but one must constantly persist. Initial efforts have produced both primary and secondary source materials otherwise unobtainable and include: Thomas Page, *The English Language: Its Sources, Growth, History and Literature* (London: Moffatt and Paige, 1883); John Foxe, *Actes and Monumentes*'...(London: John Day, 1563); "Of the Great Antiquity of Ovr English Tongve" (fragment attached to *The English Scholemaister*; Printed by the Widow Orwin, 1596); and John Hart, *The Opening of the Unreasonable Writing of Our Inglish Toung* (British Museum, MS Reg. 17C vii). Research on this topic has yet to be completed.

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMENTARIES FOR UNDERSTANDING MEDIEVAL RHETORIC

Paul E. Prill
Indiana University

Scholars of medieval rhetoric could profit from a greater use of commentaries before drawing conclusion both about the teaching of rhetoric and the philosophical issues in rhetoric during the Middle Ages. This paper examines the information about Carolingian rhetoric provided by the commentaries on Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* written by Martin of Laon, John the Scot, and Remigius of Auxerre.

Typically, students of the teaching of medieval rhetoric categorize that pedagogy as sterile and unimaginative. The commentaries suggest a different view. Specifically, these commentators often display their technical knowledge of rhetorical theory, their ability to criticize literature from a rhetorical stance and their attempt to place the taxonomic rules of rhetoric into some kind of historical context. In addition, the existence of such thorough commentaries indicates a heavy reliance on the *De nuptiis* in teaching rhetoric in ninth-century France.

The commentaries also evidence a medieval concern for the relationship between philosophy and rhetoric, particularly as that issue is articluated in the union of wisdom and eloquence. All of the commentators interpret Capella's allegory as representing such a union, and they attempt to apply their interpretation to contemporary events. Moreover, their synthesis of the three previous positions on this issue, the Ciceronian, the Capellan and the Augustinian, represents the final stage in the Christianization of the classical rhetorical tradition.

The commentaries, of course, touch on many more areas of interest to the student of medieval rhetoric than these two, but these have been singled out to indicate the utility of commentaries in corroborating and amending previous conclusions about medieval rhetoric. On the basis of this analysis, the author urges that scholars begin to edit or to include in their research significant portions of commentaries on classical rhetorical theories and on classical authors such as Virgil, Ovid, Terrence, and Cicero. It is hoped that such an endeavor will significantly enrich our understanding of medieval rhetoric.

AELFRIC: THE TEACHER AS RHETORICIAN

Luke M. Reinsma
The University of Michigan

Aelfric, the late tenth-century Benedictine monk and abbot, has not only been praised as the most important theologian, educator and prose writer of his age, but as its leading rhetorician as well. The extent to which Aelfric enthusiastically studied, expounded, and practiced the tenets of the medieval rhetorical tradition remains unclear, however. It is the purpose of this paper to clarify Aelfric's rhetorical stance and thereby, to better understand the nature of the rhetorical tradition in tenth-century England.

From four various perspectives it would appear that Aelfric wrote his homilies not as a rhetorician, but as a teacher. An examination of Aelfric's unlettered audiences demonstrates that they were especially in need of education; Aelfric responds to their need by insisting that the priests instruct in order that the laymen might know the truth. Similarly, in his own first series of *Catholic Homilies* exhortation plays a clearly subordinate role to that of instruction. Finally, Aelfric's prefatory comments on *brevitas* seek out a simple, clear language that would be understood rather than a *garrula verbositate* that would only impress.

If Aelfric's work hints at Augustine's influence, it just as readily exemplifies the anti-rhetorical tradition — the tradition that equated style with sophistry and rejected both in preference to the unadorned truth. In sum, it is not at all clear that an Augustinian tradition of rhetoric existed in tenth-century England — at least not a particularly vigorous tradition.

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF RHETORIC, POETIC AND MUSIC IN LATE MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE THOUGHT

Stephen W. Weinstock
The University of Washington

Under the influence of Renaissance Humanism rhetoric provided such arts as poetry, painting, music and literature with a verbal and conceptual idiom for creativity and expression. Rhetoric's influence on music can be seen in the theories of two German musicologists of the eighteenth century, Johann Nicolaus Forkel and Johann Mattheson, who founded their theories of music in terms of rhetoric. While further investigation is needed, this paper explores some of the various relationships of rhetoric,

poetic and music which preceded Forkel and Mattheson.

While the Medieval *Ars poetriae* fused elements of rhetoric and poetic, some writers also combined their rhetorical arts of poetry with music. For example, John of Garland, who seems to have had much influence in Germany, places his art of rhymed poetry as a branch of music. Later writers on the art of music made various relationships between music and poetic which frequently exhibited rhetorical overtones. In 1552 Adrian Coclico, who represents a major change in music from speculative theory concerned with mathematical proportions to a practical art concerned with expression, praised the poet-musician for whom the goal of music is to express all the emotions of all kinds. Although Coclico does not state that this expression is for the purpose of moving the souls of listeners, some late writers do. Girolamo Mei, for example, notes that music should not merely delight the ear, but should stir men's emotions. Similarly, Jean-Antione de Baif and Joachim Thibault de Couville note that the union of words and music serves to affect the minds and souls of listeners and to cause them to feel emotions.

Until the beginning of the seventeenth century, the expressive and affective attributes had mostly been referred to in terms of music and poetry. However, in 1599, Joachim Burmeister fuses with music rhetoric (as the theory behind practical arts of expression). Burmeister, in taking terms and concepts from rhetoric, then marks, as far as our knowledge exists today, the overt union of rhetoric with music.

Much remains to be answered as to how, why and from where rhetoric came to serve as an architechtonic art of the Renaissance. Perhaps with further investigation of the relationships between rhetoric and other expressive arts as has been done here with rhetoric and music, those answers and they implications for the future of rhetoric as the theory behind the practical art of expression may be found.

IV. Discourse Analysis

In his keynote address Professor Douglas Ehninger described the past accomplishments of discourse analysis more precisely and lucidly than we possible could. Therefore, rather than focus our report on the past, present and future of discourse analysis, we prefer to evaluate the significance of this seminar and to examine its implications for further study in the area.

The many challenging topics discussed at this seminar demonstrated interest in and dedication to the history of rhetoric. The group of participants consisted largely of academic professionals in the history of rhetoric, but also included a number of individuals with ties to other disciplines and other areas within our discipline, such as English, philosophy, oral interpretation, speech writing and business communication. This seminar provided the opportunity for these various yet related groups to come together under a common interest — the history of rhetoric. Given the opportunity, we believe individuals from various fields will continue to demonstrate their concern for studies in rhetorical history.

The greatest contribution of this seminar was to publicize and draw into focus what in the past has been a large but diffused effort by many individuals. The interest and excitement generated here should be continued in the months and years ahead. We would like to comment, therefore, on possible ways to provide greater opportunities for expression to individuals interested in the history of rhetoric.

1) Participants are urged to publicize the seminar on their respective campuses, both formally and informally. Plans are being laid for another seminar next year, and young scholars should be encouraged to prepare contributions. Faculty should be made aware of the depth and quality of the research displayed at the seminar, and persuaded of the value of continuing this reinforcement of scholarly excellence.

2) Participants and other students in the history of rhetoric are encouraged to participate in the student section at the Speech Communication Association Convention in Minneapolis next year. The section has representation and access to program time, both of which can be valuable advocates for the encouragement of scholarly efforts in the history of rhetoric.

3) Participants and other interested individuals should join organizations which encourage this interest area, such as The International Society for the History of Rhetoric, and The Rhetoric Society of America. The ISHR is being organized in America in response to the efforts of the Action Caucus for Classical Rhetoric at the last SCA Convention. The move toward greater

recognition begun by the Caucus has been broadened to include all aspects of historical research in rhetoric. ISHR will apparently seek affiliate status with SCA, providing meeting and program time at conventions to allow communication between scholars and the focus of attention on historical research. *The Rhetoric Society Quarterly* published by RSA provides research tools, reviews, articles and bibliographies of value to the scholar in rhetoric.

4) Participants and other scholars in the area should take action to promote interest in rhetoric within groups outside the area, such as other academic fields, business and government. Complaints about a current lack of writing, reading and communication skills among the young have been growing in both number and intensity. Interdisciplinary efforts that combat this growing problem have been highly successful at many universities. Instruction often includes assignments in writing, reading and speaking. Graduate students and instructors from numerous fields teach entering students under an interdisciplinary approach to hiring and instruction that could make similar independent programs attractive to other institutions. Both students and the field of rhetoric would benefit. Other program ideas could be developed to involve business and government in rhetorical programs, including extension projects and workshops under the banner of continuing education.

5) Participants should continue the contacts established at this seminar through correspondence, reading each other's papers and making constructive criticism. Mutual reinforcement and the critical clarity of outside views will certainly lead to better scholarship, if not inspiration.

6) Participants should explore the possibility of continuing communication through an inexpensive newsletter. Whether the ISHR newsletter will provide such a communication link is unclear, but some such means of continuing the momentum of the seminar should be found.

These suggestions represent the kind of involvement that we feel is necessary to sustain the spirit and the letters of this seminar.

Katy Bachman
Tony M. Lentz
Douglas Salerno
Richard L. Street, Jr.

ARGUMENT AND THE *PRO MILONE*

Katy Bachman
The University of Virginia

Cicero's *Pro Milone* may serve as the best example of argument from the ancient world. Since the speech that Cicero actually delivered has not survived, critics must turn to his published version. The extant speech, Cicero's published version, allows us to extract through criticism at least what Cicero considered to be good rhetorical practice in the defense of Milo.

In the *Pro Milone*, Cicero demonstrated that even when evidence and influence were against him, traditional argument strategy and format may be designed to fit every nuance of the situation. From a rhetorical examination of the speech, especially an examination of the arguments employed in the *Pro Milone*, scholars of rhetorical criticism will be reminded that practice takes precedence over theory. Cicero adapted typical Roman practice of oratory to fit particular purposes in the situation.

Cicero's case was based on a justification of his client's action. To accomplish *stasis* in discourse, Cicero employed three basic strategies. First, Cicero compared and contrasted patron and client; he praised Milo's ideal character and simultaneously, undermined Clodius' character. Second, Cicero generalized Milo's good character to Roman values. Milo's character was described as conforming in every way to fit the Roman conception of public service and devotion to the State. Third, Cicero presented a narration of events, *narratio* that was unique in two aspects; the *narratio* was delivered out of traditional order as delineated in *De Oratore* and Cicero presented facts that contradicted Asconius' Commentary.

Cicero's actual *Pro Milone* failed and Milo was convicted, but the published version demonstrates argumentative success, making the speech an ironic failure.

READING IN HELLENIC GREECE: A CASE STUDY IN CLASSICAL RESEARCH METHODS

Tony M. Lentz
The University of Michigan

This case study examines the methodological difficulties and strategies for a research project on the practice of reading in Hellenic Greece. After establishing the research need and significance of the topic, three methodological problems are described: typical indexes rarely included a rubric for "reading"; all primary evidence was in the Greek language; and secondary sources usually mentioned reading in general terms or in a tangential fashion. The strategies decided upon were: limitation of the study to the Hellenic Period in Greece (c. 479-330 B.C.); study of Greek for sixteen course hours; and reliance on contemporary sources with background supplied by secondary sources. The study concludes that research strategies required for many topics in the history of rhetoric require the intensive and extensive investment of time, with the result that quality research may be neglected by current demands for quantity of publication. Scholars are encouraged to be constantly aware of this cycle of diminishing returns, and to seek ways of rewarding quality research efforts through grants, convention programs, seminars and other methods of mutual reinforcement.

CAESAR'S PRE-BATTLE SPEECHES: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

Douglas Salerno
Washtenaw Community College

The military accomplishments of Gaius Julius Caesar become even more impressive when one considers that his soldiers were, for the most part, undisciplined and often lacking adequate supplies. According to at least one military historian, Caesar himself was an amateur when it came to soldiering. This study asserts that much of Caesar's effectiveness as a general was due to his speechmaking abilities which created a legendary *esprit de corps* among his soldiers. Studied here are Caesar's pre-battle speeches, a tradition he recalls several times in his commentaries on both the Gallic and civil wars. These speeches are analyzed for their rhetorical efficacy.

RHETORIC IN OVID'S *HEROIDES*: A BURKEIAN ANALYSIS

Richard L. Street, Jr.
The University of Texas

Controversy exists regarding the degree to which Ovid's *Heroides* may be considered "rhetorical." Several reasons are offered for the existence of this controversy: (1) a lack of an adequate methodology for a rhetorical examination of the letters, (2) the tendency to accept or reject the work as a whole as being rhetorical rather than passing judgment on the poems singularly, and (3) disagreement over the heroine's intentions for writing the letters. This paper suggests a new approach, Kenneth Burke's dramatistic pentad, for a rhetorical analysis of each poem in an effort to resolve the confusion. After the analysis, each poem was placed into one of four categories depending on whether a persuasive purpose was discovered. Category I, "persuasion to actuate," consisted of *Heroides I, III, IV, V, VII, X, XIV,* and *XV*. Category II, "persuasion to stimulate," contained *Heroides II* and *IX*. *Heroides XIII* was placed into Category III, "persuasion to convince." Finally, Category IV, "other," consisted of poems which were determined to have multiple or ambiguous rhetorical aims — *Heroides VI, VIII, IX,* and *XII*. Through the utilization of Burke's pentad, the investigator has been able to identify persuasive ends and means of several varieties in the letters in the *Heroides*. In view of this, the author concludes that the work may be considered "rhetorical."